REMARKS

Claims 1-18 remain pending in this application. Claims 1-18 have been rejected on the basis of 35 U.S.C. § 101. Claims 1-18 have been allowed over the prior art of record. Claim 9 has been amended. No new matter has been added. Based on the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

Allowed Claims

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the allowance of claims 1-18 over the prior art.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as failing to comply with the statutory subject matter requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 1-2 and 14-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for not being directed to a practical application producing a concrete, useful and tangible result. Specifically, the Office Action states that the claims do not appear to produce a useful and tangible result, thus requiring Applicants to distinguish the claims from the three 35 U.S.C. § 101 judicial exceptions to patentable subject matter by specifically reciting in the claim the practical application. Applicants respectfully traverse.

In determining the statutory subject matter of the claimed invention, one should look at the claimed invention as a whole. Claims 1-2 explicitly state that the simulator comprises "at least one processor." Claims 1-2 is directed to a simulator comprising at least one processor. These claims fall within the four enumerated statutory categories. Furthermore, the simulator, comprising at least one processor, is not directed to nothing more than abstract ideas (such as mathematical algorithms),

natural phenomena, and laws of nature that are not eligible for patent protection. The simulator comprises at least one processor, which is <u>not</u> an abstract idea, natural phenomena, and law of nature. The scope of claims 1-2 as a whole is <u>not</u> for the abstract idea, natural phenomenon, or law of nature itself. Therefore, the claimed invention of claims 1-2 is <u>not</u> directed to non-statutory subject matter. Moreover, the simulator is useful "for simulating operation of said circuit design" as recited in the claim. Thus, claims 1-2 are statutory subject matter.

Claims 14-16 explicitly state that the simulator comprises a simulation processor and a computer-readable medium. Claims 14-16 is directed to a simulator comprising a processor and computer-readable medium. These claims fall within the four enumerated statutory categories. Furthermore, the simulator, comprising at least one processor and computer-readable medium, is <u>not</u> directed to nothing more than abstract ideas (such as mathematical algorithms), natural phenomena, and laws of nature that are not eligible for patent protection. The simulator comprises the processor and the computer-readable medium, which is <u>not</u> an abstract idea, natural phenomena, and law of nature. The scope of claims 14-16 as a whole is <u>not</u> for the abstract idea, natural phenomenon, or law of nature itself. Therefore, the claimed invention of claims 14-16 is <u>not</u> directed to non-statutory subject matter. Moreover, the simulator is useful for simulating the operation of a design circuit as claimed. Thus, claims 14-16 are also directed to a practical application. Therefore, claims 14-16 comply with the statutory subject matter requirement and are in condition for allowance.

Claims 3-13 and 17-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for not being directed to a practical application producing a concrete, useful and tangible result. Specifically, the Office Action states that the claims do not appear to produce a useful result. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Independent claims 3, 5, 8, 9, 13 and 17 and their respective dependent claims are directed to subject matters that produce concrete, useful and tangible results. Specifically, all those claims recite the feature of "storing simulation information," which clearly produces a tangible result. Also these claims explicitly recite the specific and substantial usefulness of the result of the claimed invention. For example, claim 3 explicitly recites that the method is useful "for simulating electronic activity at an analog/digital interface in a circuit design." Claim 5 explicitly recites that the method is useful "for simulating electronic activity at an analog/digital interface in a circuit design." Claim 8 explicitly recites that the method is useful "for simulating electrical operation at an analog/digital interface in a circuit design." Claim 9 explicitly recites that the computer readable medium is useful "for simulation of electronic circuits." Claim 13 explicitly recites the method useful "for simulating a circuit design." Claim 17 explicitly recites the method useful for "simulating mixed analog/digital systems." Thus, claims 3-13 and 17-18 are directed to a practical application. Therefore, claims 3-13 and 17-18 as amended comply with the statutory subject matter requirement and are also in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, it is believed that, with entry of this amendment, all claims are now allowable and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding this amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at (650) 849-4820.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Bingham McCutchen's Deposit Account No. **50-4047**, referencing billing number **7010652001**. The Commissioner is authorized to credit any overpayment or to charge any underpayment to Bingham McCutchen's Deposit Account No. **50-4047**, referencing billing number **7010652001**.

Respectfully submitted,

Bingham McCutchen LLP

Dated: <u>April 18, 2007</u>

By: _____
Jasper Kwoh
Reg. No. 54,921

Three Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, California 94111
Telephone: (650) 849-4820
Facsimile: (650) 849-4800